

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 4, 7, 8, 11 and 17-21 remain in consideration. Claims 17-21 are hereby added. Claims 2, 3, 9 and 11-16 are hereby canceled. Claims 4, 7, 8, 11 and 17 are independent and are amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Applicants provide the following clarification of the status of the claims. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 were previously canceled. Those claims issued in the parent application S/N 09/622,884 (now Patent No. 6,711,803). Claims 2, 3, 9 and 12-16 were previously withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter in a response dated February 24, 2005 to a restriction requirement dated December 21, 2004.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 4, 7, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by:

U.S. Patent No. 5,836,506 to Hunt et al. (hereinafter, merely "Hunt"); or

U.S. Patent No. 6,253,520 to Houk.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the amendments herein.

Amended independent claim 4 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

"a slip-proof surface having corresponding concentric recessed and projected parts each composed of a mountain-shaped portion and a valley-shaped portion having a corresponding radius of curvature on a joined surface,

wherein the valley-shaped portion forms a groove continuous along the radius of curvature." (emphasis added).

As understood by Applicant, Hunt discloses a method of forming a bonded assembly including treating one of the bonding surfaces, either by roughening one of the bonding surfaces to produce a roughened portion or by drilling a plurality of holes in one of the bonding surfaces.

As understood by Applicant, Houk discloses a structure that includes interlocking box trusses containing core members held by web members and pairs of parallel spaced chord members. Each web member and each chord member has a plurality of alternating, tapering, and projecting teeth and transverse strikes on transverse edge faces and on the opposing primary faces. Each projecting tooth has a shape of a truncated pyramid with a taper on three sides. Members are locked together in groups of three and form hollow polyhedron shaped and aligned box trusses.

In contrast, amended claim 4 recites, "a slip-proof surface . . . composed of a . . . valley-shaped portion having a corresponding radius of curvature, wherein the valley-shaped portion forms a groove continuous along the radius of curvature." Thus, the amendment clarifies that the valley-shaped portion of the slip-proof surface is continuous along the radius of curvature. The

valley-shaped portion comprises a recessed part such as a groove (52B). The groove is continuous along a curved portion. *See, for example*, FIG. 10(A)-10(C).

In distinction, in Hunt the Office Action points to the drilled holes and concentrically machined grooves and projections as the slip-proof surface. The Office Action does not provide a reference number but cites to col. 3, line 50 - col. 4, line 15 and col. 6, line 14-58 wherein Applicant presumes the machined holes (28) correspond with the grooves (52B) of the present invention. However, machined holes of Hunt are in discrete locations and **not a continuous groove** along a curved portion.

Further, Houk is distinguishable for at least three reasons. First, the Office Action does not point to a “valley-shaped portion having a corresponding radius of curvature” as recited in claim 4. Second, Houk does not disclose that a “valley-shaped portion forms a groove continuous along the radius of curvature” there being no radius of curvature suggested in Houk. Third, Applicant does not see, and the Office Action does not point to, where Houk discloses the “concentric recessed and projected parts” recited in claim 4.

Thus, claim 4 is not anticipated by either the Hunt or the Houk reference because neither reference discloses each and every element recited in the claim. In particular, neither Hunt nor Houk discloses, “a slip-proof surface” in which a “valley-shaped portion forms a groove continuous along the radius of curvature” as recited in the claim.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 4, independent claims 7, 8 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

Claim 7, in addition to the distinguishing features discussed above, recites the feature, “a connecting member passing through first and second connecting holes through said first and second members respectively.” Thus, the present invention has through holes in both the first and second members and a connecting member that passes through both holes.

Hunt also is distinguishable in that the holes (28) are in the surface, not through the surface. For example, referring to FIG. 7, holes (28) are drilled in the bonding surface (14') of the sputter target (10') to a depth of about 0.065 in. Col. 6, lines 13-26 and FIG. 8. When the sputter target (10') and backing plate (16') are bonded together, metal from the backing plate (16') flows into the through holes (28). Col. 8, lines 5-16 and FIG. 9.

Houk also is distinguishable on the same feature. The Office Action suggests that the bolts (206) of Houk correspond with the connecting member (85) of the present application. However, the bolt (206) does not pass through connecting holes through both the first and second members. FIGS. 9-12. Indeed, for the Houk device to mate members (for example, 110 and 103) the bolt (206) is necessarily a part of one member and mates with a slot in a second member (103). Applicants suggest that it is not a reasonable interpretation that the slot of Houk corresponds with the through holes (58) of the present application.

Thus, neither Hunt nor Houk discloses connecting holes through both the slip-proof surfaces and a separate connecting member passing through both holes as recited in the present application.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 7, independent claims 8 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

CONCLUSION

Claims 4, 7, 8, 11 and 17-20 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800